Equal Rights

VOL. XVIII, No. 25
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY
JULY 23, 1932

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
JUL 22 1932
PERIODICAL DIVISION

Betty Gram Swing

Formerly a valiant worker for suffrage in the United States, and a wearer of the Feminist badge of honor—the Prison Pin—Betty Gram Swing also helped in the initial work of organization of the National Woman's Party before her marriage to the distinguished European correspondent for the New York Evening Post, Raymond Gram Swing. Since then, for some years resident in England, Mrs. Swing has been Chairman of the London Committee of the National Woman's Party and is an officer of the Six Point Group of Great Britain. She is also a member of the Woman's Party Committee on International Relations, of which Alice Paul is chairman, and has been active in working for a better status for the League of Nations' one woman's committee, the Consultative Committee on Nationality, taking a vigorous part in the campaign to have a new world code on nationality drawn up on the basis of equality.

Equal Rights

OFFICIAL ORGAN
of the
National Woman's Party
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D. C.
Phone, Lincoln 1366
Published Weekly
at 19 West Chase Street,
Baltimore. Md.
Phone, Vernon 3279

Edith Houghton Hooker . . . Editor
Ruby A. Black . . . Managing Editor
Dora G. Ogle . . . Business Manager

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

Nina E. Allender
Zoe Beckley
Elaine Sterne Carrington
Lucia Chamberlain
Phyllis Duganne
Ernestine Evans
Rose Feld
Zona Gale
Helen Davenport Gibbons
Rebecca Hourwich
Ruth Hale
Inez Haynes Irwin
Ada Davenport Kendall
Alma Lutz
Hazel MacKaye
Edna St. Vincent Millay
Ruth Pickering
Alice Rohe
Maryse Rutledge
Miriam Finn Scott
Doris Stevens
Sophie Treadwell
Brenda Ueland
Mary Winsor

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice, Baltimore, Md., Under Act March 3, 1879.

Subscription, $2.00 a Year
Foreign Subscription, $2.50

OFFICERS OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

President, Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Chairman National Council, Mrs. Harvey Wiley, D. C.
Vice-Chairmen,
Gail Laughlin, Me.
Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Secretary, Mrs. Dwight Clark, D. C.
Treasurer, Laura Berrien, D. C.
Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger, Cal.
Director of National Activities, Muna Lee.
Parliamentarian, Emma Fox, Mich.

Edith Ainge, N. Y.
Nina E. Allender, D. C.
Mrs. John W. Brannan, N. Y.
Mrs. Merritt O. Chance, D. C.
Mrs. Isaac H. Dixon, Md.
Bertha W. Fowler, Colo.
Elsie Hill, Conn.
Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.
Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.
Elizabeth T. Kent, Calif.
Ruth Vandeer Litt, N. Y.
Alma Lutz, N. Dak.
Burnita S. Matthews, Miss.
Dora G. Ogle, Md.
Alice Paul, N. J.
Sarah Pell, N. Y.
Elizabeth Selden Rogers, N.Y.
Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.
A. Marguerite Smith, Mass.
Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Mrs. John Jay White, N. Y.
Margaret Whittemore, Calif.
Mrs. Valentine Winters, Ohio
Maud Younger, Calif.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Annual Dues	$10.00
Associate Members	$1.00
Subscribing Members	$3.00
Founders	$100.00
Life Members	$1,000.00
Endowers	$5,000.00
Sustainers	$5,000.00

OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

The object of this organization shall be to secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships.

THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

[Senate Joint Resolution Number 52]
[House Joint Resolution Number 55]
Introduced in the Senate June 4, 1929, by Senator Gerald P. Nye, North Dakota.
Introduced in the House January 11, 1932, by Representative Louis Ludlow, Indiana.

Speaks for Itself

THE very wide-awake and up-and-doing Business Women's Legislative Council of California, of which Sue Brobst of Los Angeles is president, has adopted the plan of issuing mimeographed bulletins to its members and others, which are highly informative and instructive.

The last bulletin contained the following:

"Los Angeles *Times*, May 29, 1932.—'Assemblyman Dan Emmett, local rancher, has announced his candidacy for the Republican nomination for Congressman from the new district, which includes Tulare, Kern, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo and Ventura counties. The primary election will be held August 30.'

"We believe Dan Emmett was the author of the Assembly Bill No. 1630—'To prohibit the employment of married women by State, county, city and county, or city government.'"

A word to the wise . . . .

Smug

THAT our nationality laws are still abundantly unfair to women is shown by the recent debate in Congress on the question whether foreign husbands of American women should be allowed to enter the country without having to abide by quota restrictions.

American men who have married foreign wives have always had the privilege of bringing their wives into the country immediately, the citizenship of the husband availing to break down quota barriers for the foreign wife. But the citizenship of an American woman who married a foreigner did not extend similar quota exemptions to the foreign husband. In other words, when a bill on the subject was recently considered in Congress, the citizenship of the American woman, as affecting marriage with a foreigner, was of a quality inferior to that of the American man. It still is.

As introduced in the House, the bill would have wiped out all differences between the sexes in regard to this particular question, but the Senate added an amendment. The amendment provided that the privilege of quota exemptions should apply to foreign husbands only in the case of marriages contracted before July 2, 1932. Otherwise, quota provisions would apply as before.

Not once was it suggested, when the amended bill was brought up for reconsideration in the House, that American wives are entitled to the same consideration as American husbands; or, in fact, since husbands are still the breadwinners of families in predominating numbers that, from a selfish, economic point of view, particularly where there are children, it might be more advisable to have foreign husbands admitted promptly than foreign wives. Instead, one Representative asks whether American citizens "go abroad and marry these men?"—what if they do, forsooth?—and, when informed that the marriages took place in the United States, inquired further, 'Under what conditions were the aliens here?"

If the marriages were regular marriages and the foreigners were proper husbands—they were described as students, college professors and tourists—what further concern is that of Congress? Is the time coming when Americans, American women in particular, will be forbidden to marry any but their fellow-countrymen? Charming as the American man is in the abstract and when he is not engaged in making laws discriminating against women, isn't such an attitude a little hard on Englishmen, Germans, French and others who were not fortunate enough to have been born in the United States?

Another Representative blandly remarked that these American women "married with their eyes open, knowing the law would not permit them to bring their husbands into this country."

Still another member of the House declared sententiously that "when American women marry abroad, they should comply with the immigration laws and let their husbands take their turns in the quota and come in according to law."

American women, even those who have not heretofore been interested in standing up for their rights, can hardly overlook the insult to their intelligence which is implied either consciously or unconsciously in remarks such as these by members of law-making bodies. These men have not a paternal—they have a patronizing, grandfatherly attitude toward women. They refuse to believe that American women can grow up. But women are tired of being placed in the category of children or grandchildren. They are adult citizens and, as such, should be endowed with the responsibilities and rights of adult citizenship; and, if legislators deny them their full legal and political status, the ballot-box offers a sure means of obtaining redress. Through united, outspoken, organized opposition to all discriminations on account of sex, they can achieve their emancipation—and at no distant time.

Laura Berrien Describes Tug of War at Geneva

THE battle that has been going on at The Hague and at Geneva under the leadership of Alice Paul and Doris Stevens of the National Woman's Party of the United States to prevent discriminations against women from being written into international law through The Hague Convention and the proposed World Court Code of Laws, has been so intense and furious that those of us who go calmly about our affairs many thousands of miles away from the scene of the struggle can hardly appreciate its vehemence, or its many-sidedness.

Opposed to the idealistic woman's group are statesmen trained in the old-school diplomacy of secret agreements secretly arrived at, to whom women are a negligible factor in the scheme of things. The fact that the women of Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay now have complete equality with men as regards nationality and that, unless equality for women in international law is adopted as a reservation in the World Court Code, these priceless rights may be swept away, apparently means nothing to them at all.

At the risk of repetition and because Laura Berrien gives such a complete picture of the various phases of the struggle, we print the following from *The Congressional Record*. The request to the Senate to have Miss Berrien's statement included in the *Record* was made by Senator Hiram W. Johnson of California:

MR. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* a communication sent to me by Mrs. Iris Calderhead Walker, of the National Woman's Party, together with a statement prepared by Miss Laura Berrien of Georgia, chairman of the committee of international relations of the National Association of Women Lawyers, concerning the World Court. I also request that the reservation proposed (by request) by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye] to the World Court protocol may likewise be printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the letter, statement, and proposed reservation were ordered to be printed in the *Record* as follows:

Washington, D. C., June 29, 1932

Hon. Hiram Johnson,
United States Senate.

My Dear Senator Johnson—On May 9, 1932, Senator Nye introduced a reservation to adherence to the World Court. We ask you, when the question of the World Court is considered by the Senate, to support this reservation, and present for your consideration a statement by Miss Laura Berrien setting forth the reasons for our demand for this equality reservation.

Yours sincerely,
IRIS CALDERHEAD WALKER,
Director of Equality Reservation Campaign for the National Woman's Party.

STATEMENT OF MISS LAURA BERRIEN, OF GEORGIA, CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN LAWYERS:

We have asked for a reservation to the World Court. We have been forced to take this step. We had not believed until very lately that, if the United States joined the World Court, the status of women would be affected because we hoped and believed that the nationality convention which was adopted at The Hague in 1930, and which has been hailed by the League of Nations as the beginning of international law to be administered by that court—we had believed that that convention would not be forced upon the women of the world by the League of Nations. Struggling to change State laws and Federal laws back in 1924, we were heartened when we read that the League of Nations proposed to codify international law. The League stated that it was its purpose to start a code of world law and that it was hoped that this law would be written with a progressive spirit. Women were led to believe that the old outworn customs and disabilities under which women labor would be disregarded and a new law with a better spirit written. So we began to watch for the subjects that were going to be considered for codification. A great number of subjects were under consideration. One by one they were discarded. Others were substituted. Finally nationality involving more than anything else the relation of women to their government and therefore one of great concern to us, was agreed upon. It was the only subject that bore vitally upon the rights of women as such. So in 1924 we began a study of the position of women in nationality which embraced all the countries of the world. We have the laws in the originals. We have had them most carefully translated. We have gone to the expense of having our interpretations verified by the representatives of the respective governments here and by the home governments. We have drawn up tables showing what the laws of the world on this subject reveal concerning women's nationality. These tables cover some 83 countries. Some of them show the most primitive laws, while others reveal the most advanced laws. We find that in our Western Hemisphere four countries have granted women complete equality with men as regards nationality—Argentina, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay.

This work was done by the joint efforts of the Woman's Research Foundation and the nationality committee of the Inter-American Commission of Women, the Inter-American Commission of Women being an agency formed by the governments of the Western Hemisphere and charged with the duty and responsibility of investigating the laws relating to women of the Western Hemisphere and reporting to the next Pan American Conference on that subject.

American women were secure in their nationality until 1907, when a law was passed that made a married woman lose American nationality upon marriage to a foreigner. At that time we were very busily engaged in the struggle for suffrage. It is very significant that the first thing women did after they obtained the ballot was to secure the amendment, in fact, to secure practically the repeal of the 1907 law in so far as it applied to women, and to secure the passage of the Cable Act, in 1922; that was a great step in the direction of equality in nationality for the women of the United States. The Cable Act has been amended twice since, and both amendments give a greater measure of equality to women. There are now before Congress other bills to perfect that law and there have been expressions from the House of Representatives and from the Senate, which lead us to believe that soon we will be one of the countries of the Western Hemisphere with a law which is equal as between men and women.

We drew up a convention on nationality for presentation to the conference on codification of international law and sent it to The Hague by our representatives. It concerned only equality between men and women in nationality. We did not go into any other phase of nationality. Remembering the historic American policy on expatriation going back to before the War of 1812, we felt perfectly sure that American men were able to safeguard the American traditions and secure a nationality law that would take care of those principles which we in common with you cherish.

We felt that it was our duty to safeguard the rights of women, and so we sent our convention to The Hague. Even before that, in 1928, Doris Stevens, chairman of the Inter-American Commission of Women went to Geneva and secured at the League of Nations the passage of a resolution which asked the governments to appoint women delegates to this conference in view of the very great interest

that women had in the question of their nationality.

In response to that resolution our own Government did appoint a woman delegate, Miss Ruth B. Shipley, head of the Passport Division of the Department of State. In all the rest of the world there was just one woman delegate, making two at The Hague conference with over 300 men.

Representatives of the greatest organizations of women in the world went to The Hague conference and placed before the conference their views on nationality.

Women were practically unanimous. All of the great women's organizations of the world have indorsed equality of nationality for women, organizations, international, national, and state, too numerous to name—but practically all organized women have made their desire known on this subject; and their desires are exactly the thing that we have asked for, equality in nationality.

These women, especially American women, sought to enlist the support of the delegates from the 48 countries represented. They hoped the European friends of progress would join the more progressive North and South Americans.

The Western Hemisphere is far more advanced in the matter of women's nationality than are other parts of the world. Representatives of Latin American countries at this Hague conference were most friendly to equality. There were representatives from other parts of the world who were very friendly toward the desires of women, but the Latin American representatives were particularly so. When some of the Latin American delegates considered forming a bloc of votes against the nationality convention drawn up by the League of Nations, league politicians threatened them with loss of the various positions of honor and power which the league is able to bestow.

When it became evident that no agreement would be reached on the other subjects under consideration, on territorial waters, or on the responsibilities of states, Mr. Politis, a league boss, who was chairman of the subcommission on nationality—he was a very able chairman—was determined that some convention should come out of the conference, and he was going to brook no interference from the women. To prevent women from interviewing members of the various delegations who were willing to see them, the Dutch police were ordered to prevent American women further from entering the Peace Palace, where the conference was held — a palace built by American funds given by Andrew Carnegie. Secret Service men trailed American women throughout the remainder of that conference, watching their every movement. The women were not deterred; there was too much at stake. A world code was being launched, and women were determined to do their utmost to see that it would be just to women.

While these women were working at The Hague, the women in our own country were doing all they could to shape events at the conference. There were deputations to the President of the United States asking him to instruct the delegation of the United States to vote for nothing but equality. A group of lawyers, a group of business women, groups from States far and near, went to the President. I remember so well talking it over with him and asking a great many of the Senators their position on the convention being negotiated at The Hague. Many Senators gave out statements saying that the United States would never vote for a convention which discriminated against women, and that a convention discriminating against women would never receive their vote for ratification in the Senate. It cheered us and heartened our colleagues at The Hague.

You can imagine, worrying as much as they were, what it meant to them when they received a cable from this side, for example, saying that Senator Borah says he will not vote for a convention which discriminates against women, and a like expression from Senator Fess, Senator Walsh, Senator George, in fact, from a large number of Senators.

We were constantly in touch with the situation at The Hague through our women, who kept us informed. I remember the last day of the conference. We had been told by the State Department the day before that no convention on nationality would be signed. We were very anxious about it, because our women at The Hague were cabling us the contrary. They told us there would be a vote and that women would be overwhelmingly defeated. We went to the President of the United States that last day. We went about 9 o'clock in the morning. I think it was around 10 o'clock when we finally saw the President. It was the most anxious moment that I have ever known. We felt we were almost sure of defeat from the rest of the world, but we were also fearful lest our own Government would be trapped into this, even though we had been told that our delegation would not stand for inequality.

We were told by the President that the United States would not vote for the convention and would not sign the convention. When the vote was cast, a convention based on inequality had been adopted by a vote of 40 to 1, the United States alone voting against inequality.

This Hague conference is the basis of all our troubles. The nationality convention was adopted at The Hague. The day following its passage the State Department gave out a statement saying that the United States had been unable to vote for it for two reasons, one of which was that the provisions relating to the nationality of women were unsatisfactory, and a number of Senators had indicated their stand so strongly that it was absolutely certain that it could not pass the Senate. The House passed a resolution approving the position taken by the United States delegation.

No sooner was the convention adopted than the women of the world repudiated it. Women from Asia, Australia, Europe, North and South America spent the best part of the next two years preventing ratification and asking reconsideration of the question. At the earnest solicitation of women upon American women's initiative, the League of Nations created a women's consultative committee by resolution of the council to report their advice to the League of Nations. The women's consultative committee was composed of able representatives from the eight leading women's international organizations—

International Council of Women, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Inter-American Commission of Women, Equal Rights International, World Union of Women for International Concord, All-Asian Conference of Women, International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship (with which the League of Women Voters is affiliated), and International Federation of University Women.

Alice Paul, as chairman of the nationality committee of the Inter-American Commission of Women, drafted a convention which was unanimously approved by the commission, representing the 21 American republics. It was also unanimously approved by the governing board of the American Institute of International Law.

The consultative committee met in July, 1931, and drew up this report. They utterly repudiated the convention which had been adopted by The Hague and urged the League of Nations to reopen the subject of nationality and secure a new convention which would be agreeable to women.

The League of Nations gave the committee a room in the League of Nations buildings at Geneva and facilities for meeting, but, when they met and repudiated the convention, the entire situation changed. There was no room for women to meet a second time when it was found they were not going to rubber stamp the convention adopted by The Hague.

The Hague then tried to abolish the consultative committee of women, which was organized to tell The Hague what women wanted; and the League of Nations is now pressing for ratification of The Hague convention. It takes only 10 votes to make that convention law. Then we are being urged to go into the

World Court which is to administer this law as its code, and the consultative committee, acting as adviser to the league for women, is apparently to be abolished.

So, you see, we are threatened on three sides. Never believing this could happen we have perhaps waited too long, but this situation has made it necessary for us to ask that, if the United States is going into the World Court, the interest of women be protected by seeing to it that we will not go into the court if it means adoption of a code of law that has been entirely repudiated by all the women of the world, and, I may say, by the Government of the United States.

The two Houses of Congress and the executive branch of the Government of the United States have made their stand in the matter well known.

We are asking a very little thing. To go into the World Court without this equality reservation would be a backward step with regard to the rights of women.

The convention provides that it is to go into effect when 10 countries ratify it. It will then form part of the code of law to be administered by the World Court. That was the purpose of calling the first world conference for the progressive codification of international law. And although it would not be imposed on a country that did not agree to its terms, the World Court would be bound to consider this convention as evidence of a rule of law on the nationality of women since this would be the only international agreement on the subject. It is the cornerstone of a new world code unjust to women.

Gail Laughlin Condemns Discharge of Married Women

"WE are constantly being reminded in these times of the publicity-loving clergyman who had no subject for his sermon, and who suddenly exclaimed with great enthusiasm, 'I know what always gets them! I'll wallop the ladies!'" declared Gail Laughlin on Sunday afternoon, July 10, at the tea held by the Government Workers' Council of the National Woman's Party in the garden at Alva Belmont House. Mrs. Edwin Austin Avery, chairman of the Council, presided, and introduced Miss Laughlin as one of the outstanding women of our day.

National Vice-Chairman of the Woman's Party, Gail Laughlin, is a member of the Maine, Colorado, New York, and California State bars, and has been admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States. She has served two terms in the Main Legislature and is again the Republican nominee for her district. Her feminism has been an inspiration to her colleagues for thirty years.

"In this era of depression," Miss Laughlin continued, "the first impulse seems to be to 'wallop the ladies.' Women are everywhere being made the object of attempts to force them out of industry and back into unpaid labor in the home." She spoke in general of legal discriminations, existent and pending, relating to women's paid work, and in particular of the provision affecting married women in the Economy Bill which has just passed Congress.

Discussing this bill, Miss Laughlin showed how the proposed dismissal of Government employees because of marriage is unjust and arbitrary, placing retention or dismissal in the service on another basis than efficiency and merit, the only bases which should be considered. Because of this fact, she declared, such legislation is unsound economically; indirectly, sex will be used as the basis of dismissal or retention. Insofar as efficiency ceases to be a basis for employment, this legislation is a return to the spoils system of the days of Andrew Jackson, which has been replaced by the merit system in the public service.

She said she hoped that the attention of the taxpayer has been called to the fact that by the enactment of such legislation the basis for retention in the Federal service has been changed from efficiency, which means saving to the taxpayers and is certainly desired by them at all times and especially now, to the question of whether the employee is single or married; and, if married, whether or not both parties to the marriage are Government employees.

The Government is not a philanthropic institution, and employment in its service should not be given on the basis of the need of the worker. If need is to be the basis of employment, then information should be gathered as to the income of the worker, the expenses that the worker has to meet, the use made of the money and the worker's responsibilities.

"There is too much sloppy thinking as to the principles of government employment and unemployment," Miss Laughlin declared. "It is not improbable that this and too much loose debating on the minimum wage and living wage, have a great deal to do with the present depression. The only wage that is just is the right wage for an honest day's work; no other basis is sound. The basis for all rewards should be merit and efficiency."

Miss Laughlin added that, if there is to be a favored class, it should be composed of the mothers of the country. She said that more often than not a veteran of the World War has explained, that his request for help from his Government is based not so much on the time he has given and the discomforts he has suffered as on the fact that he has risked his life. Miss Laughlin reminded her hearers that every mother has risked her life when she has given birth to one of these heroes even though she does not go around demanding recompense on that score.

"This bill penalizes marriage," Miss Laughlin said emphatically. "Congress should take this into consideration and answer the question, 'Should marriage be penalized?'" She recalled how, in the past, the fear has been expressed that granting women property rights and allowing them to go into industry might keep men from desiring as wives the women who had these rights and so prevent marriage. Now, on the other hand, if this bill is to stand, women already married will be faced with the problem of giving up their husbands or their careers; and unmarried women will refuse to marry, in order to hold their jobs, pursue careers, and be economically independent. An excuse for low wages has been that women are not stable in industry, because they leave their jobs to get married. Now that women are more inclined than men to make their government service a career and are indisputably reliable and stable, Congress passes this bill which will force them to give up their jobs upon marriage.

"Almost all men and most women think the world was made for man." It reminded Miss Laughlin of the story of the little brother and sister who were sitting on a hassock where there was hardly room, and the boy said, "If one of us would get off, there would be room for me."

"Seventy-five years ago, the textile work

READER TELLS TALE OF POOR ADAM CLERK WHOSE WIFE WORKS

Editor, The News:

Once upon a time there were three men:

Franklin Roosevelt of New York, John Garner of Texas, and Adam Clerk of Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Roosevelt worked for a living and had for years—

Mrs. Garner worked for a living and had for years—and—

Mrs. Adam Clerk also worked for a living:

SO:

Mr. Roosevelt is nominated for President,

Mr. Garner is nominated for Vice-President,

Adam Clerk is faced with dismissal unless he stops living with his wife.

Consistency, Thou Art a Jewel.

J. S.

—Reprinted from Washington Daily News, July 7, 1932.

of the household was done by the women, all the garments were made by the women; today all employees in the textile factories, electric light plants, cheese and milk business, are doing work which was formerly woman's work. So long as she worked for no pay, there were no objections. However, as soon as she followed these activities into the industrial world and received pay for her services, restrictions began to be put on her, and she was accused of doing man's work.

"Work does not belong to any one class nor sex," the speaker said. "It belongs to the person who is best qualified to do it and will do it best. Considering the subject on any other basis is a blow to efficiency.

"The provisions of this bill make marriage a disability. Women have no bloc to protect their rights; they should organize and present a solid front. Solidarity is what women need. Turning the other cheek may be good as abstract ethics, but women get nowhere by such meek tactics. Remember the stage coach driver who bragged that he could take his whip and flick a fly off the ear of the leading horse. One of the passengers suggested, as the coach passed a hornet's nest, that the driver flick the nest, but he expostulated, 'No, sir; them's organized.'"

Miss Laughlin concluded with a brief and convincing exposition of the Equal Rights Amendment as the surest way to bring women under the guaranty of the Constitution and insure Equal Rights for men and women.

Another Injustice to American Women

IN *The Congressional Record* under date line of July 7, last, appears the speech of the Hon. Samuel Dickstein of New York, chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, on the proposed exemption of the husbands of American citizens from restrictions placed upon them by quota provisions.

Mr. Dickstein states that, when the House, on April 18, voted on this bill, the roll call stood 209 to 112 in favor, and that the measure as then voted on provided for exemption from the quota of the husband of an American woman so as to "put her on a par with a male citizen; in other words, equalize the right or status of male and female." Then the matter went to the Senate and, according to Mr. Dickstein, "a few of my colleagues got busy. . . . They told all kinds of bugaboo stories. They said that under this bill the gates of the United States would be thrown open to all the world.

"So the Senate adopted an amendment by which and under which they have exempted from quota restrictions these husbands of American women up to and including July 1, 1932. . . . After July 1, if any marriages take place, naturally the husbands will have to go within the quota and will have to take a preference within the line."

On the previous day, Mr. Dickstein had asked the House for "unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report (report of the conferees of the House and Senate and containing the Senate amendment referred to) on the bill (H. R. 10600) which has already been unanimously agreed to by the Senate." The questions asked and the discussion that ensued are illuminating. Here are a few excerpts:

MR. COOPER of Ohio. Do American citizens go abroad and marry these men?

MR. DICKSTEIN. These marriages took place in the United States; at least most of them. These marriages took place two or three years ago.

MR. COOPER of Ohio. Under what conditions were the aliens here?

MR. DICKSTEIN. Some of them were here as students, some as professors in colleges, and some as tourists. They have all been investigated by both departments and they have been found to be legitimate. They have to comply with all the requirements of the law. They must be physically fit, morally fit, and fit otherwise for admission.

* * * * *

MR. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this is what was known among restrictionists as the unemployed husband's bill, which permits American women to marry foreigners and bring foreigners to America. I have opposed this bill all along.

* * * * *

MR. DYER. This is only doing for American women who are citizens of the United States what you are doing under existing law for men who are American citizens. It is trying to equalize the situation as to American citizens who are women. Men who are American citizens have had this privilege for a long time.

MR. DICKSTEIN. Let me say that Senator Reed, who is a restrictionist on a par with the gentleman from Florida, has given this matter most careful study. My friend from Ohio [Mr. Jenkins] could not attend the conference because of some unforseen railroad accident. Nine conferees out of ten have unanimously agreed to the conference report. The House bill gave a larger preference in that the House bill permitted a complete exemption permanently. However, the Senate and the House conferees finally agreed that the dead line be July 1, 1932. It only takes care of those women who believed they had a right to marry and bring in their husbands. They have American children who have never seen their fathers. They all must comply with the law, and it is purely a restrictionist measure. I am pretty sure everyone will be willing to support such a humanitarian proposition.

* * * * *

The matter was side-tracked and discussion was resumed the following day. Among those who spoke was Representative Jenkins of Ohio, who argued that the passage of the bill meant letting down the bars in regard to immigration.

"The bill seeks to let in the husbands of wives," he continued, "who married with their eyes open, knowing the law would not permit them to bring their husbands into this country. Under the present law, if a husband marries a foreign-born woman, in a foreign country, he is entitled to bring her in outside of the quota, but subject to the law as to criminals and insane and kindred classes. That has been the law for a long time. When the law was changed a few years ago, it was provided that a wife who marries a foreign-born husband, cannot bring him in outside of the quota, but she may bring him in within the quota and within the preferences within the quota. The quota permits all husbands, who are qualified everywhere in the world who have made application, to come in—all but four, and why do you want to let down the quota laws, the whole fabric of the law, for four foreign-born husbands, living somewhere across the ocean, about whom we know nothing."

During the course of his argument, Mr. Jenkins was interrupted by Representative Schafer of Wisconsin, who reminded him that "many of those who talk against this bill on the ground of establishing a precedent stood up and voted for the Ulrich bills to establish a precedent for one single case because a man was a multimillionaire. They voted for the precedent to allow him to bring in his wife, although she had been convicted of larceny three times and was barred from admission."

Strong objection to the passage of the bill was also voiced by Representative Green of Florida. Declaring that he stood for immigration restriction as a general principle and that "we already have too many foreigners in this country and that, if there was to be any immigration legislation, he favored the Moore bill, Mr. Green continued:

"When American women marry abroad, they should comply with the immigration laws and let their husbands take their turns in the quota and come in according to law."

Press Comment

One of "Sanest Groups in America"

Palo Alto News, Palo Alto, Cal., July 5, 1932.

MAN started out by being absolutely unfair to woman and now woman is getting back at him. He eulogized peerless woman, the queen of the home, the light of the earth, the guiding star of our civilization, and so on, and so on. He, however, kept her away as far as possible from power. At last, she demanded and got a lot of power. Had man not sung her praises to the stars? Was she not a compendium of all that was worthwhile on earth? And what could the poor dub do? Woman escaped the home cage. She worked for less in the office and the factory and drove man out to an alarming extent. She clothed nude statues and stopped men from expectorating except on the wide prairie. She fell for every altruistic humbug. She substituted the speakeasy for the corner saloon. She became the prey of the high-powered merchandiser and bought hundreds of million of dollars worth of contrivances and doodads her families didn't need. She used sex appeal in the business world to sell poor goods as against better values offered by mere man. And to cap the whole thing, man, the chivalric dub, ashamed of himself, is looking on mutely now while woman, having caught her second wind, is beginning to undo a lot she has done. A group of women, one of the sanest groups we have in America, have even sponsored a constitutional amendment which in effect says: "We are just as good as men. To prove it, we want any privilege accorded women as women in our laws wiped out. We want perfect equality."

French Senate Debates Woman Suffrage

New York Times, June 24, 1932.

WITH the public galleries overflowing and the area around the Luxembourg Palace under re-enforced surveillance by the police and Republican guardsmen, the Senate opened general debate today on the bill for women's suffrage.

The sitting was not disturbed by incidents of any kind, though many women were among the spectators, and there was no attempt at a demonstration. Women's suffrage leaders, in fact, indignantly protested against the police measures, declaring that they had no intention of causing disorders at the moment when the Senate, after nine years of constant agitation, had consented to debate the measure seriously.

Before the discussion began it was announced that the Senate would first hear the speakers scheduled for general debate and afterward take a vote on whether the bill should be made an urgent measure or shelved for later consideration, article by article.

Today's orators, who were representatives of various parties, were all more or less favorable to the measure, which has already ben sponsored by the lower house. All the time-honored arguments in favor of women's suffrage were reviewed over the stereotyped opposition of scoffers.

Louis Marin, the author of the bill, told the Senate the woman of France possessed absolutely no legal rights, while accepting all responsibilities before the law, as well as financial duties. Another Senator recalled that France owed its existence to a woman—Joan of Arc—and another quoted Ralph Waldo Emerson as saying that woman was the most potent civilizing influence in the world.

The Socialist, Alexandre Bachelet, argued that fewer German women than men had voted for Hitler and said this indicated the superior intelligence of women voters.

Senator Jenouvrier declared the time was past when women's suffrage and the Salvation Army were subjects for ridicule and was loudly cheered when he declared the Salvation Army now was recognized officially as an institution of public merit.

Progress Often Gets "Beyond Control"

The Star, Tucson, Arizona, July 1, 1932.

ARIZONA has come prominently into the spotlight of this great and exciting Democratic convention. The delightful personality of Mrs. Isabella Greenway has claimed and captivated old and young politicians and newspaper men and women. Stories telling of her charm, beauty and good sense are being printed throughout the country in the largest dailies.

Today Mrs. Greenway made the first speech seconding the nomination of Governor Roosevelt, and she did it well. With the eyes of 25,000 spectators, delegates and alternates on her and a radio audience of millions listening, she spoke in a clear, well measured voice that carried to every corner of the great stadium and every part of the United States. Her brief speech was interrupted three different times by warm applause, and at the end it received enthusiastic applause.

The boom that Nellie Bush of Yuma County started in behalf of Mrs. Greenway has gone beyond all expectations, and all control. The newswriters have seized upon it, and throughout the nation stories and pictures of Mrs. Greenway are appearing. The best part of it all is that Mrs. Greenway says exactly the right thing at the right time, and is not taking the matter seriously; indeed, she is enjoying it immensely. Telegrams have been coming in from all of the country from women's clubs and many prominent women, congratulating Mrs. Greenway. She has had to hire a secretary to take care of all the demands made upon her. When she sits down to dinner in the hotel, reporters and photographers surround her for interviews and pictures. Thus do Arizona and Tucson receive publicity throughout the country.

The humorous part about it is that the Arizona delegation did not realize what it was starting. The men on the delegation wanted to stop it after the first burst of publicity, and so did Mrs. Greenway, but now it is beyond all control. Her name will be presented and she will get more than the votes of the Arizona delegation.

In still another way Mrs. Greenway is attracting attention for Arizona. The scores of distinguished politicians who sit on the platform behind the speaker's stand flock about her and do their best to win her attention and favor. When she finished her speech seconding the nomination of Governor Roosevelt, Will Rogers stopped her and promised his vote if nominated.

Greater Recognition Won by Indian Women

New York Times, July 8, 1932.

LIKE the two Simon reports which include the same subject, the "Report of the Indian Franchise Committee," issued in London on June 3, and briefly outlined in cabled dispatches, is both concrete and general.

Its concrete recommendations include an increase of the number of voters for the Provincial Legislatures to 14.1 per cent. of the population and the number of British subjects who may vote for the proposed Federal Legislature to 3.3 per cent. of the entire population of 338,000,000. The number of women granted the franchise by the Simon reports is more than doubled, with seats for women in the Provincial Legislatures.

These are the chief specific recommendations. The generalizations include a proposal to secure a large registration of the suppressed classes as voters, to increase labor representation in the Provincial Legislatures, to preserve university, commercial and land-owning representation there, and also to create some representation for the aboriginal tribes.

Unlike the Simon reports, however, the

present one, which is the work of a committee headed by Lord Lothian, constituted by the Prime Minister last December, does not deal with the communal problem, which was beyond its terms of reference.

By raising the electorate for the national Legislature the committee realized that it was confronted with a problem unexampled in history; the Federal Legislature (of from 500 to 600 members) thus elected would have charge of the affairs of about 338,000,000 people — a number never before receiving laws from representatives of their own choosing. The only near parallel is the United States, where Congress makes the national laws for a population of 150,000,000.

The raising of the Provincial electorates from 2.8 to 14.1 per cent. would mean to increase the number of registered voters from 7,108,000 to 36,000,000, while increasing the British-Indian vote (omitting the vote of the semi-independent States) from 0.4 to 3.3 per cent., would mean an increase of those competent to elect the members of the projected Federal Legislature from 1,142,000 to 8,440,000. The increased enfranchisement of women means an augmentation of their voting strength from 315,000 to 6,600,000, and there is to be a reserve of between 2 and 5 per cent. of the seats in the enlarged Provincial Legislature for women members.

Regains Lost Citizenship

San Francisco Chronicle, June 26, 1932.

A JOKER in the Cable Act has sneaked up on Government officials, surprising them almost as much as it shocked Mrs. Genevieve Davis Cosh, 801 Sutter street, concert singer.

Mrs. Cosh went into Federal Judge St. Sure's court as it convened yesterday and regained a citizenship she didn't know until recently she had lost. She was born in Santa Rosa, and in 1926 she went on a theatrical tour in Australia, and while there married James L. Cosh, advertising man and British subject.

Under the Cable Act native-born American women do not lose citizenship by alien marriages, but they must register if living in a foreign country. An American consul in Australia let her register once, but told her it would not be necessary to do so again. She returned here on a visit last year, and was to sail to Australia on July 6.

With her sailing two weeks away, she received a letter from the State Department that the Cable Act provided she must register every two years, and that it could not recognize her citizenship. She was a woman without a country, because Cosh's marriage to her did not confer British citizenship. She went to the Federal building, and no one there knew of the two-year clause, which got in when the Cable Act was amended in 1930.

After she was repatriated yesterday Mrs. Cosh said she was going to do a lot of registering in Australia hereafter.

But Things Have Changed Since the Fall

The Sun, Baltimore, Md., July 15, 1932.

THE Business and Professional Women's Club of Baltimore has received one of four cash prizes of $45 for a survey of conditions among older women in the business and professional field.

The prize was awarded by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and the Exposition of Women's Art and Industry. The survey was made by Miss Laura L. Pratt, a social welfare worker in the northeast district of the Family Welfare Association and a member of the Business and Professional Women's Club. The survey was made last fall.

Miss Pratt in her survey said she found no discrimination against married women or women in general, but much discrimination against age.

Vigorously Opposes Mayor's Proposal

The Star, Delmarva, Del., July 3, 1932.

EDITOR, Delmarva *Star*: In the annual message of the Mayor of Wilmington, he makes the unjust and ridiculous suggestion to discharge all married women employed by the Board of Education whose husbands are also on the payroll of that department, and further that only unmarried women be employed as teachers. Under our constitutional right to "life, liberty and happiness," the right to make a living is included. So far as education is concerned, fitness to educate should be based on efficiency—not sex or marriage. This depression through which we are passing will not be helped by throwing women out of work in order to give their jobs to men. I protest against this proposed discrimination against women.

FLORENCE BAYARD HILLES.
(Mrs. William S. Hilles.)
July 2, 1932.

Bars Equal Rights For Canadian Women

New York Times, June 28, 1932.

POLITICAL questions such as the nationality of married women will not be discussed at the Imperial Economic Conference at Ottawa, J. H. Thomas, Secretary for the Dominions, informed the House of Commons this evening.

The Minister's statement was an outcome of active lobbying by ardent Feminists, who are anxious to get all the units of the empire committed to a policy of Equal Rights.

Their grievances include the loss by a British woman of her nationality on marriage to an alien; the fact that naturalization is not granted to married women on the same terms as to married men; and the fact that alien women carrying a British subject automatically receive British nationality. They want the nationality of the British-born woman put on the same footing as the nationality of the British-born man.

Victims of Unequal Rights

The Baltimore Sun, June 24, 1932.

TWENTY-TWO girl employes of the Resisto Manufacturing Company, 122 West Fayette street, charged with working more than ten hours a day, were released on their own recognizance for grand jury action at a hearing in the Central Police Court yesterday afternoon.

Louis Kahn and Joseph Silberman, proprietors of the establishment, also were released for grand jury action on charges of allowing the girls to work long hours. Magistrate James R. Cadden sent the case to the grand jury on request of the firm's counsel.

The girls, according to the testimony of Mrs. Edith Maynard, were summoned after several employees complained to the State Bureau of Labor and Statistics that they were forced to work more than ten hours daily, the legal limit. Some of them, however, told the magistrate their "father had no work." One had a "sick brother at home" and some were the sole support of their families.

Mr. Silberman told the magistrate the factory had received a rush order and was going to employ more help. Some of the girls, he said, asked to be allowed to work overtime, and he consented.

Women and International Law

The Vote, London, England.

THE National Woman's Party of the United States of America is carrying on a campaign to ensure that the States shall adhere to the International Court of Justice only with the following reservation: "Providing that the code of law to be administered by the World Court shall not contain inequalities based on sex." This is an object lesson in sound Feminism, as The Hague Nationality Convention will testify.

DAY PRINTING COMPANY
PUBLICATIONS AND BOOKS
600 East Lombard Street
Baltimore, Md.